



State of Wisconsin \ DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Jim Doyle, Governor
Scott Hassett, Secretary

101 S. Webster St.
Box 7921
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7921
Telephone 608-266-2621
FAX 608-267-3579
TTY Access via relay - 711

BMP Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

December 13, 2006

Best Western Midway, Wausau, Wisconsin

Committee Members Present:

John DuPlissis, UWSP; Teri Heyer, USDA FS; Mary Platner, Wisconsin Association of Lakes; Larry Meicher, Trout Unlimited; Dave Stoiber, International Paper; Steve Karianen, SFI SIC; Mike Gehrke, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association; Tim Tollefson, Stora Enso North America; Jim Olive, FISTA; Earl Gustafson, Wisconsin Paper Council; Miles Benson, Wisconsin Council on Forestry; Bob Rogers, Society of American Foresters; Matt Dallman, The Nature Conservancy

DNR Staff Present:

Carmen Wagner, Kristin Shy

Additional Guests:

Brian Weigel, Ph.D., DNR Science Services

Welcome and Introductions: John DuPlissis

John welcomed the group and asked for introductions. John reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

Advisory Committee Operational Guidelines and Antitrust Statement: Carmen Wagner

Carmen reviewed the addition of an Antitrust Statement to the Operational Guidelines, which was suggested at the last meeting. It is the same antitrust statement used by the Karner Blue Butterfly program and has been approved by DNR legal staff. The Committee agreed on the importance of this addition. Bob Rogers suggested one change which will be made for the next meeting. John DuPlissis explained the importance of this statement because of who is represented at the Committee meetings. At the beginning of each meeting, the antitrust statement will be "in force" and everyone is expected to follow it. The final formal copy of the Operational Guidelines with this addendum will be handed out at the next meeting.

Transitioning New Members: John DuPlissis

John explained that some members have been involved with this Committee for a long time and are ready to transition out. It should not be dictated who from your organization should be represented – this decision should be made by the organization itself. John suggests that new members be mentored. The new Committee member is suggested to sit through two meetings with the current member. For consensus decisions at these meetings, the new member will be

allowed to voice their opinions, but if a vote is required, only one vote is allowed per organization. Consensus was reached on this item.

A discussion followed about organizational changes between various companies/organizations and how to manage this in terms of representation on the Committee. This will be addressed on a case by case basis. Carmen reminded the Committee that if there are organizations not represented here that suggestions are always welcome, keeping in mind that the size of the Committee should stay at a manageable number.

2006 Forestry BMP Monitoring: Kristin Shy and Carmen Wagner

Kristin presented the preliminary results from the 2006 cycle of BMP monitoring. BMP monitoring teams visited 28 federal and 33 industrial timber sales. Initial results show that most commonly, for both landowner categories, BMPs were applied correctly where needed and no adverse impacts to water quality were observed. Kristin explained that the next steps include a formal analysis of the data by DNR Science Services staff and the writing of report, to hopefully be completed in February 2007. After this monitoring cycle, we will have statistically valid results for all landowner categories in the state (except tribal). Carmen explained that the sampling composition mirrored landownership patterns.

Several Committee members expressed the importance of loggers being on monitoring teams. Discussions will be held with SFI SIC to see if it will be possible to offer continuing education credits for loggers who participate.

Kristin also presented results from the exercise at the last meeting where Committee members had a chance to use the USFS Regional BMP Monitoring Protocol. A summary of the results was presented which included the general results of the two methods, how they compared, and a discussion of the potential short comings of each method. A data recorder was passed around for Committee members to look at.

Carmen explained that 22 timber sales monitored for regular BMP monitoring were re-monitored with the regional protocol to work toward determining if this is a monitoring method Wisconsin should move toward. When results are obtained, they will be shared with the Committee for discussion at the next meeting.

Mike Gehrke commented that he was involved with the regional monitoring exercise and realized that if you come to a unique situation it is difficult to capture the specifics of that scenario with the regional protocol. Larry Meicher asked if the regional protocol addresses fish passage. Kristin explained that both protocols do – Wisconsin looks more at asking specifically if fish passage is impacted, whereas the regional protocol looks more at culvert installation and maintenance, like culvert width.

2007 Forestry BMP Monitoring: Carmen Wagner

Carmen explained that we are at a logical point to discuss options for 2007 and future monitoring because we have now sampled all landowner categories with statistical validity. Carmen presented three options for future BMP monitoring and the advantages and disadvantages of each option (refer to handout in binder for detailed information on the three options).

- Option 1: Continue using existing Wisconsin BMP monitoring protocol
- Option 2: Use USDA FS Regional BMP monitoring protocol
- Option 3: Use a hybrid of Wisconsin BMP & USDA FS BMP monitoring protocol

Each committee member was asked to voice their input on which option they felt was most logical. Most people voted for the hybrid option, or a phased approach eventually leading to using the regional protocol. Some of the common opinions included:

- A cost analysis comparing options 2 and 3 is needed and will play a role in determining the best option.
- Agreement that the quantitative data provided by the regional protocol is critical to have and the importance of removing some of the subjectivity of the Wisconsin protocol.
- Importance of being able to compare data collected with a new monitoring protocol to past data so that 10 years of data is not lost and we are not trying to compare “apples to oranges”.
- Advantages of data recorder and automated report, although concerns over how report can be shaped for Wisconsin and also the issue of the data recorder not being a way to capture everything (unique situations like Mike mentioned).
- Importance of teams we use now and continuing with that, but benefits of smaller teams in time/cost savings.
- What would be the impacts to certification if we switched to the regional protocol?
- Teri asks, “What data does Wisconsin need from the USFS protocol that they aren’t getting and can that be addressed in the 20 additional questions?”

Plans for monitoring in 2007 are to use the existing Wisconsin protocol and monitoring a landowner category other than NIPF due to time/cost of monitoring NIPF. More detailed information addressing the concerns listed above will be pulled together about options 2 and 3 to share at the next meeting. Plans will then be developed throughout 2007 for the chosen option to be implemented in either 2008 or 2009.

Monitoring the Effectiveness of the RMZ: Brian Weigel

Brian gave an overview of the research that is currently being conducted to determine if our RMZ BMP guidelines are effective at protecting water quality.

Overall question of research: Does the 100’ buffer provide adequate protection for stream health?

Brian explained the components of the study, including what is being measured and why, the methodology, and an overview of the sites currently being assessed. In the end, 30 sites will be monitored using a BACI (before-after-control-impact) design. For each site, 1 year of pre-harvest stream data and 2 years of post-harvest stream data will be collected to determine if harvesting impacted stream health. The control sites will be upstream of the timber harvest. Sites are/will be in the northern lake and forest ecosystem and stream systems associated with timber sales will include a variety of sizes, gradients, discharge, temperature, dominant substrate, etc. Timber sales represent various harvest types and ownerships. All sites have a 200 foot RMZ or less and the cut must have been adjacent to the stream for half of the station length. They need help identifying more sites.

Several comments and questions from the committee were brought forth with the following responses:

- We sample the sites for two years post-harvest because we should be able to see discernable impacts by then.
- Sampling is done once a year – fish and macroinvertebrate communities should have responded to impacts in that time frame.
- There are threshold values above which stream impacts are consistently seen and with that information we could compare impacts from forestry to impacts from agriculture and urban activities.

Soil Disturbance Monitoring and Education Efforts: Carmen Wagner

Carmen presented information on the recent soil disturbance monitoring she conducted on state timber sales. The broad objective of the monitoring was to determine whether forestry practices on state lands are protecting soil resources. Sales were randomly chosen from a list of state timber sales open as of July 1, 2006. Sales must have had some harvesting occurring or had been recently completed. In total, 30 timber sales were monitored. Sales were on a variety of state properties including state forests, state parks and wildlife areas. Of the 30 sales, Carmen did not observe ruts or gullies on 9 timber sales. Ruts or gullies were observed on 21 sales, with 2 of the sales having ruts that met the definition of “excessive”. On the 19 sales that had rutting which was not excessive, the primary cause of the ruts or gullies was harvesting equipment.

Carmen also explained that she will be analyzing the results of this monitoring exercise and creating a report to share. Carmen has ideas for changes to the monitoring protocol for future monitoring exercises, for example, monitoring the sale before and after harvest so an understanding of how the site changed can be obtained.

Teri Heyer felt that other states would be very interested in this and when the results are pulled together, she thinks a video conference call sharing the information would be great. Carmen also mentioned to the Committee that the March SAF meeting will be focusing on soil disturbances so some of this information will be shared at that meeting.

Forestry BMP Field Manual: Kristin Shy

There are only 400 BMP Field Manuals left and so it is a good time to consider some updates instead of simply reprinting. The goal is to make the manual more widely used and user friendly. As discussed in previous Committee meetings, we will not be updating/changing the BMPs at this time. Potential changes/updates include adding color photos and diagrams, updating contact information and regulatory/statutory information, and adding more background information about why certain BMPs exist. The Committee agreed that this should be done. Draft changes will be made and shared at an upcoming meeting.

Other Forestry-Related Items: Carmen Wagner and Kristin Shy

Wisconsin Act 79:

On December 6, the Natural Resources Board approved adoption of s. NR 1.25, Wis. Admin. Code. This provides that a forestry operation may not be declared a nuisance if the forestry operation conforms to generally accepted forest management practices. The next step is legislative review.

Ch. NR 320 – Wis. Admin. Code – General Permits for Temporary Stream Crossings for Forest Management Activities:

The Natural Resources Board approved changes to ch. NR 320, Wis. Admn. Code, for a new general permit for temporary stream crossing for forest management activities. In late October, the rule received legislative approval. Permit application materials are now being developed and should be ready shortly.

Silvicultural Exemption for Wetland Roads:

Carmen discussed a meeting she was involved with looking at the use of the silvicultural exemption. In general there are cases in which this exemption is being improperly used and it will be looked at more closely to be sure that people meet the necessary criteria to use the exemption.

Coastal Management Program Grant:

Work has been progressing on this grant project. Two steering committees have been pulled together; one to help with the Lake Michigan projects and one to help with the Lake Superior projects. Two reports are currently being written, which will contain background information, explanation of the issues, and a thorough listing of the management guidelines that have been pulled together. The reports will be shared and discussed with the steering committees and edited as suggested. When technical reports are completed, work will begin on publication of a pamphlet and development of displays and training materials regarding the red clay and trout stream forest management guidelines.

Funding Received for Several Publications:

The DNR's Forestry Leadership Team awarded the BMP program \$4,000 to develop four new publications. Initially, these publications will be web-based and as usage is tracked over the year, printing may occur in 2008.

Temporary Stream Crossing Structures for Forestry – Directory of Available Structures

This publication will explain the benefits of using these structures, the new temporary stream crossing general permit, and will provide a listing of the various agencies that have these structures available for loan.

Harvesting Timber: Do I Need a Permit?

Building Forest Roads: Do I Need a Permit?

Crossing Streams: Do I Need a Permit?

These publications will explain what situations permits are needed for and why the permits are required. Information will also include permit standards and the process for obtaining permits in an effort to clarify this process for foresters, loggers, and landowners.

NEXT MEETING: FEBRUARY 14, 2007
 Central Wisconsin